UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,817	08/31/2001	Gene Golovchinsky	FXPL-01001US0	2360

23910   7590   11/12/2004

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER
RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/944,817	GOLOVCHINSKY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Laurie Ries	2176

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*31 August 2001*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>*31 August 2001*</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>*6/5/2002*</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-38 and 39-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 through 38 recite a "system for detecting an annotated anchor"

which is an abstract idea not tangibly embodied in a computer

readable/executable medium.

Claims 39 through 50 recite a "method for detecting and processing a

plurality of annotated anchors in a plurality of documents" which is an abstract

idea not tangibly embodied in a computer readable/executable medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 14-20, 22-27, 31, 33, 36-42, 45, and 48-53 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingram (U.S. Publication

2002/0052890 A1) in further view of Schilit (U.S. Patent 6,279,014 B1).

As per claim 1, Ingram discloses a system, method and apparatus for

detecting hyperlinks or anchors within a document when the cursor is moved

over the hyperlink or anchor. (See Ingram, Page 1, paragraph 0011). Ingram

does not disclose expressly that the hyperlinks or anchors are annotated. Schilit

discloses a system and method for recording annotations in electronic

documents. (See Schilit, Column 4, lines 32-33, and lines 39-40). Ingram and

Schilit are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of

assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the

time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art to include the annotations of Schilit with the hyperlinks of Ingram. The

motivation for doing so would have been to extract for the reader certain

information of interest to the reader without adding the need for additional

notetaking. (See Schilit, Column 3, lines 20-29). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Schilit with Ingram for the benefit of easily obtaining

information of interest to a reader to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As per claim 39, Ingram and Schilit disclose the method for detecting and

processing annotated anchors as described above. Schilit also discloses this

method pertains to more than one document or page. (See Schilit, Column 6,

lines 14-16). Ingram and Schilit are analogous art because they are from the

same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and

organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the method of Ingram

and Schilit with the multiple documents of Schilit. The motivation for doing so

would have been to allow the reader to navigate between and evaluate multiple

documents. (See Schilit, Column 6, lines 5-9). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Schilit with Ingram for the benefit of improved navigation

between documents to obtain the invention as specified in claim 39.

Claim 51 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

As per claim 2, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 1 as

described above. Ingram also discloses that an anchor or hyperlink is detected

which represents an explicit link to at least one other location. (See Ingram,

Page 1, paragraph 0011).

As per claim 3, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 1 as

described above. Ingram also discloses that an anchor or hyperlink is detected

which represents an implicit link to at least one other location. (See Ingram,

Page 2, paragraph 0039).

As per claim 4, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 1 as

described above. Ingram also discloses including a data structure to reference

the annotated anchor of Ingram and Schilit as described above. (See Ingram,

Page 3, paragraph 0041).

As per claim 5, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 1 as

described above. Ingram also discloses code for processing the annotated

anchor of Ingram and Schilit as described above. (See Ingram, Page 2,

paragraph 0039).

As per claims 6 and 40, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of

claims 1 and 39 as described above. Ingram also discloses code for generating

and displaying a data structure including the annotated anchor of Ingram and

Schilit as described above. (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041).

As per claim 7, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the data structure includes a number of the annotated anchors of Ingram and Schilit as described above. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039).

As per claim 8, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the number of annotated anchors are obtained from at least one document. (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041).

As per claims 9, 10, 41, and 52, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claims 7, 39, and 51 as described above. Schilit also discloses that the annotated anchors of Ingram and Schilit as described above are displayed in a format or order. This format includes annotation metadata or attributes. (See Schilit, Column 4, lines 29-38). Ingram and Schilit are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the formatted display of Schilit with the system and method of Ingram and Schilit. The motivation for doing so would have been to better organize the material for a reader. (See Schilit, Column 3, lines 22-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schilit with Ingram and Schilit for the benefit of improving data organization and storage to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9, 10, 41, and 52.

As per claims 14 and 42, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of

claims 9 and 39 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the annotated

anchors of Ingram and Schilit as described above each represent a link to at

least one target, and that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors

according to the target data. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040).

As per claims 15 and 53, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of

claims 14 and 51 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the target is a

second document. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040).

As per claims 16 and 17, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of

claim 5 as described above. Schilit also discloses code which includes adding

the annotated anchor of Ingram and Schilit as described above to a data

structure based on at least one attribute, and that the data structure has a

number of annotated anchors that have at least one attribute value. (See Schilit,

Column 4, lines 29-38). Ingram and Schilit are analogous art because they are

from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying

and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the data organization by

attribute of Schilit with the system and method of Ingram and Schilit. The

motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate the retrieval of the

documents. (See Schilit, Column 4, lines 33-36). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Schilit with Ingram and Schilit for the benefit of improved

data retrieval to obtain the invention as specified in claims 16 and 17.

As per claim 18, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Schilit also discloses that the number of annotated anchors of Ingram and Schilit as described above are obtained from a number of documents. (See Schilit, Column 6, lines 14-16). Ingram and Schilit are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the data from multiple documents of Schilit with the system and method of Ingram and Schilit. The motivation for doing so would have been to The motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate the retrieval of the documents. (See Schilit, Column 4, lines 33-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schilit with Ingram and Schilit for the benefit of improved data retrieval to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

As per claims 19 and 20, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Schilit also discloses that the number of annotated anchors of Ingram and Schilit as described above are displayed in a format, and that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to the annotation metadata or attributes. (See Schilit, Column 4, lines 29-38). Ingram and Schilit are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the data organization by attribute of Schilit with the system and method of Ingram and Schilit. The motivation for doing so would have been

to facilitate the retrieval of the documents. (See Schilit, Column 4, lines 33-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schilit with Ingram and Schilit for the benefit of improved data retrieval to obtain the invention as specified in claims 19 and 20.

As per claim 22, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the annotated anchors of Ingram and Schilit as described above each represent a link to at least one target and were the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to the target metadata. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraphs 0039-0040).

As per claim 23, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the target is a second document. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040).

As per claim 24, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the annotated anchor of Ingram and Schilit as described above represents a link to at least a first target, and that the code includes locating a second document which includes a reference to the first target. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040).

As per claim 25, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the document contains a second annotated anchor representing a link to at least a second target and that the code includes locating at least a second document that includes a reference to the first and second targets. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraphs 0040-0041).

As per claim 26, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the annotated anchor of Ingram and Schilit as described above represents a link to at least a second document and where the code includes obtaining the second document. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040).

As per claim 27, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the second document is obtained prior to a reader requesting the second document. (See Ingram, page 2, paragraph 0040).

As per claims 31 and 45, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claims 5 and 39 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the code includes detecting a second anchor representing a link to the target and suppressing a display of the second anchor, allowing the reader to see only an item listed in the taskbar. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040).

As per claim 33, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the second anchor is within a second document. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040).

As per claims 36 and 48, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claims 5 and 39 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes identifying, in the hypertext structure, a node representing the target and suppressing a display of the node, allowing the reader to see only an item listed in the taskbar. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040).

As per claims 37 and 49, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claims 36 and 39 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the code includes identifying, in the hypertext structure, an object representing the link and suppressing a display of the object. (See Ingram, Page 4, paragraph 0054).

As per claims 38 and 50, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claims 5 and 39 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes displaying the annotated anchor and the target. (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0047).

Claims 11-13, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingram and Schilit as applied to claims 9, 19 and 51 above, and further in view of Sundaresan.

As per claim 11, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Ingram and Schilit do not disclose expressly that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to the annotated anchor metadata. Sundaresan discloses associating hyperlinks according to their metadata. (See Sundaresan, Column 8, lines 63-67, and Column 9, lines 1-8). Once hyperlinks are associated by their metadata, it would be inherently obvious to display the hyperlinks using this associated format. Ingram, Schilit and Sundaresan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art to include the metadata association of Sundaresan with the system and method of Ingram and Schilit. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with access to information which is related by relevance to a particular topic or set of attributes as is contained within a document's metadata and to reduce the number of reoccurring documents. (See Sundaresan, Column 3, lines 37-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sundaresan with Ingram and Schilit for the benefit of improved data organization to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

As per claim 12, Ingram, Schilit and Sundaresan disclose the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the annotated anchors of Ingram and Schilit as described above each represent a link to at least one target, and that the annotated anchor metadata, as disclosed by Sundaresan, includes a number of anchors within the document representing the target. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraphs 0039-0040).

As per claim 13, Ingram, Schilit and Sundaresan disclose the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the annotated anchors of Ingram and Schilit each represent a link to at least one target, and that the annotated anchor metadata, as disclosed by Sundaresan, includes a number of annotated anchors representing the target. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraphs 0039-0040).

As per claim 21, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Ingram and Schilit do not disclose expressly that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors of Ingram and Schilit according to

annotated anchor metadata. Sundaresan discloses associating hyperlinks

according to their metadata. (See Sundaresan, Column 8, lines 63-67, and

Column 9, lines 1-8). Once hyperlinks are associated by their metadata, it would

be inherently obvious to display the hyperlinks using this associated format.

Ingram, Schilit and Sundaresan are analogous art because they are from the

same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and

organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the metadata association

of Sundaresan with the system and method of Ingram and Schilit. The

motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with access to

information which is related by relevance to a particular topic or set of attributes

as is contained within a document's metadata and to reduce the number of

reoccurring documents. (See Sundaresan, Column 3, lines 37-41). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to combine Sundaresan with Ingram and Schilit for the

benefit of improved data organization to obtain the invention as specified in claim

21.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ingram and Schilit as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Stern.

As per claim 32, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claim 31 as

described above. Ingram and Schilit do not disclose expressly that the second

anchor is within the document. Stern discloses that an anchor can be a link to

another anchor in the same file. (See Stern, Column 7, lines 37-41). Ingram,

Schilit and Stern are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the internal link of Stern with the system and method of Ingram and Schilit. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the reader to easily reference data included in the current document. (See Stern, Column 1, lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Stern with Ingram and Schilit for the benefit of improved data readability to obtain the invention as specified in claim 32.

Claims 28, 30, 34-35, 43-44, 46-47, 54-55 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingram and Schilit as applied to claims 5, 39, and 51 above, and further in view of Bays.

As per claims 28, 44, and 55, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claims 5, 39 and 51 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target and that the code includes detecting a second anchor representing a link to the target. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Ingram and Schilit do not disclose expressly propagating the annotation to the second anchor. Bays discloses that annotations may be written to other data items. (See Bays, Page 6, paragraph 0081). Ingram, Schilit and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the

propagation of annotations to other data items of Bays with the annotated anchor representing a second target of Ingram and Schilit. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate similar items by propagating the annotations to these related items. (See Bays, Page 2, paragraph 0017). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bays with Ingram and Schilit for the benefit of associating by annotation related items to obtain the invention as specified in claims 28, 44 and 55.

As per claim 30, Ingram, Schilit and Bays disclose the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the second anchor is within a second document. (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0042).

As per claims 34, 46, and 56, Ingram and Schilit disclose the limitations of claims 5, 39 and 51 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes identifying, in a hypertext structure, a node representing the target. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Ingram and Schilit do not disclose expressly propagating the annotation to the node. Bays discloses that annotations may be written to other data items. (See Bays, Page 6, paragraph 0081). Ingram, Schilit and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the propagation of annotations to other data items of Bays with the annotated anchor representing a second target of Ingram and Schilit. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate similar items by propagating the annotations to

these related items. (See Bays, Page 2, paragraph 0017). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to combine Bays with Ingram and Schilit for the benefit of

associating by annotation related items to obtain the invention as specified in

claims 34, 46 and 56.

As per claim 35 and 47, Ingram, Schilit and Bays disclose the limitations of

claims 34 and 46 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the code

includes identifying, in the hypertext structure, a connecting object representing

the link, such as a graphic element, and altering the connecting object, such as

reducing it's size. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039).

As per claims 43 and 54, Ingram, Schilit and Bays disclose the limitations

of claims 39 and 51 as described above. Bays also discloses that processing the

annotated anchor includes determining whether the second document or data

item is stored in the system and obtaining the second document or data item if it

is not already stored in the system. (See Bays, Figure 3D, and Page 6,

paragraph 0083). Ingram, Schilit and Bays are analogous art because they are

from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the

invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

include the acquisition of the second document or data item of Bays with the

annotated anchor of Ingram and Schilit. The motivation for doing so would have

been to establish a complete information management system which includes all

data necessary for the user. (See Bays, Page 6, paragraph 0084). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to combine Bays with Ingram and Schilit for the benefit

of including all pertinent data or documents to obtain the invention as specified in claims 43 and 54.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingram, Schilit and Bays as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Stern.

As per claim 29, Ingram, Schilit and Bays disclose the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Ingram, Schilit and Bays do not disclose expressly that the second anchor is within the document. Stern discloses that an anchor can be a link to another anchor in the same file. (See Stern, Column 7, lines 37-41). Ingram, Schilit, Bays and Stern are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the internal link of Stern with the system and method of Ingram, Schilit and Bays. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the reader to easily reference data included in the current document. (See Stern, Column 1, lines 43-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Stern with Ingram, Schilit and Bays for the benefit of improved data readability to obtain the invention as specified in claim 29.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Gough (U.S. Patent 5,559,942) discloses a method and apparatus for providing a note on an application program which includes noticing a note anchor object associated with a data file displayed by an application program on a computer screen and displaying a note slip image over the displayed data and images of the application program.

- Tribbeck (U.S. Publication 2002/0059333 A1) discloses a data processing system for accessing documents including hypertext links with an associated initial display text is provided with a mechanism for applying one or more predetermined rules (94) to the initial displayed text to determine whether or not that initial displayed text has characteristics indicative of being insufficiently readable by a user.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is 703-605-1238. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the

PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have any

questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LAR

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER